DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 284 940 UD 025 687

TITLE Recommendations to the Chancellor, the New York City Board of Education, Superintendents and Principals Regarding the 1986-1987 Attendance Improvement/Dropout Prevention Apportionment and the Dropout Prevention Program.
INSTITUTION Public Education Association, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE May 86
NOTE 18p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attendance; Community Organizations; *Dropout Prevention; *Dropout Programs; Educational Environment; High Schools; *Middle Schools; *Program Administration; School Holding Power; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *New York City Board of Education

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes the key findings, conclusions, and recommendations of an analysis of 1985-86 outcomes of New York City's state-funded Attendance Improvement-Prevention (AI/DP) program and the city-funded Dropout Prevention Program. The central goal of the evaluation was to understand conditions which encouraged success in middle school programs and to determine the political and organizational conditions which affected implementation. The programs' designs are briefly described and major findings are outlined. These concern 1984-85 outcomes; level of program implementation in 1985-86; level of student and staff satisfaction with the programs; and interaction between school climate and program design. Finally, ten recommendations are presented and discussed. These include: (1) per capital funding of at least $1,700 per student should be provided; (2) the target population should include seventh graders and students who frequently cut classes; (3) increased schoolwide planning is necessary; (4) ongoing, school-based staff development activities are needed; (5) initiatives must be designed which respond to the continuing needs of students who are technically no longer eligible for services; (6) continued experimentation with program designs is called for; (7) solutions to the overcrowding at target schools must be devised; (8) the central Board of Education must facilitate contractual collaboration agreements with community based organization; and (9) program assessment that ties implementation findings with outcome results is needed. (KH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Public
Education
Association

39 West 32nd Street
New York, New York 10001
(212) 868-1640

ED284940

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CHANCELLOR, the NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION, SUPERINTENDENTS & PRINCIPALS

Regarding the

1986-1987 Attendance Improvement/Dropout

Prevention Apportionment and the

Dropout Prevention Program

UD025687

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. S. Frankl
Pub. Ed. Assoc.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

May, 1986

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Recommendations to the Chancellor,
the New York City Board of Education, Superintendents, and Principals
Regarding the 1986-87 Attendance Improvement Dropout Prevention
Apportionment and the Dropout Prevention Program

Introduction

The 1985-86 school year has been animated by the Board of Education's continued efforts to reduce the large numbers of students leaving school without a diploma. For this undertaking, the state-funded Attendance Improvement/Dropout Prevention program (AI/DP) and the city-funded Dropout Prevention Program (DPP) distributed more than $30 million to over 130 needy schools.

With support from the Carnegie Corporation, the Public Education Association undertook an analysis of outcomes of the 1984-85 AI/DP program and an analysis of implementation of programs in 17 schools receiving funds under the 1985-86 AI/DP-DPP allocations. There were nine high schools and eight middle schools in our implementation sample. Four of the middle schools and six of the high schools collaborated with community based organizations (CBOs). In our high school sample there were ten different CBOs; in our middle school sample there were two. Schools in the implementation study were visited at least three times. In the course of the school year, more than 200 hundred interviews were conducted with students and staff.

What follows is a summary of the key findings, conclusions, and recommendations from both analyses. This summary is prepared in anticipation of policymakers' interest in the implications of our research for program development in the 1986-87 school year. A final report will be released in late June.

Framework for the 1984-85 Outcome Analysis

The central goal of the analysis of outcomes from the 1984-85 AI/DP program was to understand conditions which encouraged success in middle school programs. We systematically compared the most and least successful middle schools to frame our response to this question.

Framework for the 1985-86 Implementation Study

One goal of the PEA implementation analysis was to understand better the political and organizational conditions which affected implementation of AI/DP and DPP programs. Another goal was to understand the relationship of program content/design to student and staff satisfaction with the initiative. As considerable consensus has developed that implementation failures are failures of organization, the facts regarding the implementation of these programs were examined within the broad framework of organization theory. Our thinking about program design was informed by the literature on effective schools, school improvement, and alternative schools.

There are six overarching questions: (1) how well implemented were each of the 17 programs, (2) what accounted for implementation delays in each case, (3) how satisfied were students and staff with the various programs, (4) what accounted for their varying degrees of satisfaction, (5) what was the climate for learning in the schools into which each of the programs was introduced, and (6) how did school climate interact with the program implementation effort.

Design of Programs in the Implementation Analysis

The DPP program operates in 10 high schools and 29 middle schools which feed into those high schools. It has a systemic component which provides funds for broadbased school improvement activities not specifically directed at truants and an individual ameliorative aspect (case management) which funds special support services for individual truants, often provided by community based organizations (CBOs). The program at the middle school level is almost entirely ameliorative in emphasis, and in 15 schools, the providers of the support services are CBOs. The program in the high schools varies from school to school but tends to combine systemic and ameliorative (case management) components.

The AIDP program is active in 26 high schools and 68 middle schools. The emphasis at the high school level is structural. Sixteen AIDP high schools are implementing a modified mini-school program for truants called SOAR (Student Opportunity, Advancement, and Retention). Seven additional high schools are developing strategies based on SOAR. Three of the 26 AIDP high schools are taking an ameliorative (case management) approach and have contracted with the Federation Employment and Guidance Services (FEGS), a CBO, for the provision of support services to truants.

While the AIDP emphasis at the high school level is structured around the classroom, the AIDP program at the middle school level is almost entirely ameliorative. It provides support services and incentives outside the classroom to at-risk students; the services are provided by school personnel.

Each of the 97 middle school programs (AIDP and DPP included) has received $150,000 to serve 150 students in the 1985-86 school year. Students are eligible for service in these programs if they were absent 15 or more days in the spring of 1985, or 30 or more days in the 1984-85 school year.

Most of the AIDP high schools are serving 150 students with funding averaging $200,000. To be eligible students must have been absent at least 20 days in the spring of 1985 or at least 40 days in the entire 1984-85 school year. Funding for DPP high school programs is variable based upon the size of the school and the extent of the need. It ranges

from over $150,000 to nearly $800,000. DPP schools direct a portion of their resources to serve their entire 9th and 10th grades; most also include case management activities which target smaller populations. To be eligible for these services students must be absent 25 or more days during the spring term or, for up to five percent of the program participants, more than 10 days in each of the first two months of the current year.

Major Findings

Outcomes from 1984-85

Middle schools which managed to improve student attendance had developed service-intensive programs which supplemented attendance monitoring and outreach with direct academic and emotional support to students. Successful middle schools spent a minimum of $1,700 per capita on target students. Well implemented programs spending as much as $1,000 per capita failed to produce a positive effect.

Level of Program Implementation in 1985-86

Implementation is defined as the date personnel associated with the various programs began to function in their designated roles. Table I illustrates implementation by showing the accruals resulting from late start-ups. (The schools expect to redirect the accruals into program activities during the remainder of the school year.) As Table I shows, high school programs organized around classroom interventions (SOAR and Strategies) were very timely implemented as were the systemic aspects of high school DPP programs. All middle school programs were delayed, and all programs in the high schools and middle schools requiring collaboration with community based organizations were delayed.

Implementation, it seems, was enhanced when programs were either highly compatible with school organization, that is, built around the classroom, or when the schools were given a great deal of discretion about activities (ownership) and some planning time as in the systemic aspect of the high school DPP program.

Whether they were located in high schools or middle schools, with CBOs or without CBOs, the most difficult programs to implement were the ameliorative programs. The problem schools encountered collaborating with CBOs in ameliorative programs rests with the Central Board of Education. This year as last year the Board of Education did not facilitate the negotiation of CBO contracts.

Different factors accounted for the late implementation of ameliorative programs developed by the middle schools themselves. Since school staff were not involved in the design of ameliorative programs and no planning time was allocated, even program facilitators were not in place until late October or November. The further orchestration of school personnel to provide support services and incentives took still more time.

Given the circumstances few middle school principals felt their November commencement dates were out of the ordinary. Among those who did, one said the problem was due to a faculty grievance over the hiring of the facilitator, another said it was because teachers were not interested in the mentoring component of the program, a third related his problem to hiring delays at the district level.

These explanations for delays also appeared at the high school level. One high school principal spoke of the unavailability of staff, another of the onerous hiring procedures, still another of the disinterest of teachers in the program. At the high school level, however, because the SOAR was so organizationally adaptable to the schools, there was much greater ease in overcoming difficulties.

From all of this we conclude that there is a relationship among program design, program management, and implementation. Designs which are ancillary to the classroom, that do not have a "neat" organizational structure, and require the integration of a number of school personnel, need a planning period during which staff can be recruited, and trained, and integrate their efforts with ordinary school processes. Otherwise the organizational complexity of the initiative leads to delays.

Project SOAR is organizationally compatible with school structure. It did not require much planning for schools to orchestrate a classroom-based intervention. The systemic aspect of the DPP program, while it took different forms in different schools, required considerable interaction among staff, but staff were given autonomy and time to plan, and it was timely implemented. The middle schools were at the greatest disadvantage as their design required collaboration, but there was no planning period, no flexibility, and little ownership.

Level of Student and Staff Satisfaction with Programs

We asked five students and five or more staff members in each of the schools we visited to evaluate the program. Students were asked whether they liked the program, whether they liked school more this year, and, if they were coming to school this year more than last year, whether the program had helped them come more. Table II displays students' responses to those several questions.

Most of the students in every program reported liking the program "a lot." There were differences, however, in the degree to which enrollment in the program seemed to be affecting overall attitudes toward school. Ninety percent of the SOAR/Strategies students liked school more this year. Seventy percent of students in the DPP programs liked school more, but less than 60% of students in either AIDP or DPP middle school ameliorative programs liked school more this year. Among those students who reported coming to school more this year, most attributed it to the program, but this was especially true of DPP high school students, and they were in large measure responding to the systemic aspect of the program and not the CBO component. We must recall, however, that at the time of our interview, due to delays approving contracts at the Board of Education, CBO programs had been in operation less than one month.

We asked students to explain the factors associated with their satisfaction ratings. The high school mini school programs (SOAR and Strategies) had the advantage of providing strong academic supports to students, and the majority seemed to require and appreciate this support. It had the disadvantage, however, of making students feel labeled and set apart from the mainstream of life in the school and this was a problem. Hopefully in the context of its rather strong general performance the program can evolve and take account of these important concerns.

The DPP high school program has something to teach in this regard. DPP high school students felt very substantial satisfaction with the jobs-component of their programs, where they existed, and the case management component. Because these components are not well developed in SOAR, especially job preparation, they may go a long way toward relieving students' sense that they are losing out on some advantages when they are in a more restrictive program.

Labeling played a negative role in middle school programs, as it had in SOAR. It was obvious that students in middle schools were receiving special help because they were often pulled out of class to see counselors, etc. Dissatisfaction was intensified at the middle school level, however, because the students felt not only that they were being labeled "retarded," but that they were also forced to miss needed instructional time. They, of course, were right. The contradiction here is so pointed the design of the program must be reconsidered. If the standard organization of middle schools is so inflexible that periods cannot be blocked for support services than it seems necessary that services be restricted to before and after school or that mini schools like SOAR be set up to facilitate reorganization.

The results of the interviews with teachers indicate that the most critical point to be made about staff satisfaction is that teachers who had a direct instructional role with students had the most difficulty with the program. The students were, they felt, extremely unmotivated and hard to teach.

Interaction between School Climate and Program Design

We asked students in each school to estimate the severity of the school's pre-existing truancy/dropout problem, to estimate the frequency of student misconduct, to evaluate the adequacy of the pre-existing academic program and support services, and to indicate their overall happiness with their school.

There were some unpredicted differences between middle schools which received services from CBOs and those which were given the opportunity to develop programs of their own. Students rated the pre-existing conditions at schools receiving CBOs as poorer on most indicators. This is surprising because there did not seem to be a conscious decision to use the CBOs in the more troubled middle schools.

As expected DPP high school students felt truancy was more severe in their schools than the AIDP high school students felt it was in their schools. This is predictable since the DPP schools were assigned to that category because they were felt to have systemic difficulties.

Notice in this regard that while students in DPP high schools felt their dropout problem was worse than students in AIDP high schools felt their dropout problem was (and they were right) they did not generally feel their schools were more poorly organized. This leads one to speculate that the DPP schools' higher dropout rate stems, in part, from problems in their students' earlier education. On reflection, the fact that the direct feeders to the DPP high schools (the middle schools which received CBOs) were, in this study, found to be more distressed than the direct feeders to the AIDP high schools makes sense. One would expect distressed middle schools to create problems for their receiving high schools.

Two considerations relevant to these findings emerge. First, the ameliorative approach has to be judged with some reference to the social organization of the schools in which it is attempted. Students in highly disorganized schools may not be as benefitted by this approach as students in less disorganized schools. The CBO middle schools, for example, may be at a decided disadvantage. Second, dropout prevention efforts must increase at the middle school level. This investigation provides another piece of evidence that middle schools are the incubators for early school leaving.

Perhaps, in addition, the ameliorative approach should not be the only strategy at the middle school level or even the strategy of first resort in schools with a poor climate for learning. When we asked principals what other strategies needed to be considered to improve the climate for learning, they suggested limiting the size of schools and balancing enrollment so that at least 50% of the students in any school were age-grade appropriate. We add to that the "systemic" and the "structural" approaches.

Conclusions

Timeliness of implementation we tentatively conclude is a function of both project design and project management. Organizationally simple programs built around classrooms are far easier to implement than programs which require substantial coordination of resources. More organizationally complex programs i.e. those which require coordination with a number of school personnel, need substantial lead time and a ongoing mechanism for planning and organization. The difficulty implementing middle school programs and programs with CBOs can be seen as a function of both the relative complexity of the design and the virtual absence of a planning process. The systemic aspect of the DPP program was complex, but staff were given the opportunity for summer program planning and considerable autonomy in program development.

While program implementation is vital to program success, the simplicity of program design and its compatibility with organizational norms is only one of several important matters to consider in program development. Programs must be responsive to the real needs of students and staff. Real needs are often complex and unpredictable. Some students, perhaps most at-risk students, require the structure and support of a mini school, others feel stifled by that environment and can succeed in the mainstream with the support of a good guidance counselor, still others are not adaptable to the "talking cure" but can be motivated to stay in school if there's a good sports, dance or art program. In effect, every school that serves the at-risk could benefit from the combined strengths of a systemic approach, an ameliorative approach, and a structural approach.

Table 1V illustrates this point. It summarizes students' and staff assessments of the strengths and weaknesses of the various programs. Each program has strengths another lacks and people receiving or providing service in one program inevitably seek to complement their efforts with the components of another program. This is not to say that all programs are equal; it is to say that dropout prevention programs must have considerable depth and breath. Ultimately the search for effective program models is a search for organizational structures which can coherently weave together the matrix of interventions.

Recommendations

The recommendations which follow relate the foregoing findings and conclusions to the key policy decisions facing the Board of Education.

1. Per Capita Funding of at Least $1700 Per Student

We may be underfunding dropout prevention programs in the middle schools. Programs which were spending $1,000 per capita in the 1984-85 school year, identified by the Office of Student Progress as model programs because of their attention to full service implementation, were unsuccessful in reducing truancy. Given the absence of a strong infrastructure of attendance services, when schools were spending at that level most of the money was concentrated in attendance monitoring and outreach and an insufficient amount was available for supportive services. The key to spending decisions is to be certain that sufficient resources exist to provided a meaningful level of direct support. In the 1984-85 program year it took $1,700 per capita to yield the necessary depth of service.

2. Target Population to Include Seventh Graders and Students with "Cutting" Problems

The substantial cost of this program is in part a function of the population targeted. By chosing to serve youngsters who are dropout-prone, rather than those having incipient or transitional

attendance problems, the school system has approached the most difficult problem first. It's a courageous approach, and one which we hope policy makers will essentially maintain. Allowing at the margin for youngsters who are severely in need but not covered by the guidelines to get help, the overwhelming majority of students (90%) should be severely at-risk as defined by the current guidelines amended to included standards for cutting as well as day long truancy. We further recommend to the extent possible under the law the inclusion of seventh grade students in the target group as attendance first starts to decline precipitiously in the seventh grade.

3. School-Wide Planning and Coordination through a Summer Institute

The AIDP program makes significant organizational demands on the school system. To offset the disorganization and fragmentation troubling the middle school program increased school-wide planning is necessary. We believe the most productive form would be a summer institute for approximately ten key school and community program planners. That approach worked well in the Mayor's 1985-86 dropout prevention program. The institute, led by the school principal, would develop and coordinate AI/DP with related school (especially PREP) and community based efforts, and integrate their various lessons for dropout prevention. Such joint pre-planning would increase staff ownership, reduce the start up delays that vitiated program dollars this year, and more than compensate for the cost. It would also foster meaningful collaboration, not mere coexistence, between schools and the CBOs with which they work.

4. On-going School-Based Staff Development for Instructional Personnel

The most frequently reported reason for delays in the school-based aspect of AIDP/DPP programs was the inability of the schools to find instructional staff interested in working with truants who, as a group, are viewed as unmotivated and extremely difficult to teach. The turnover rate in instructional staff projected by the AIDP teachers was above 50%. The irony of this situation is that the students viewed the instructional staff very favorably and, as a group, these teachers seemed especially competent. Unless SOAR and other teachers are helped to develop the skills needed to reach these youngsters and feel the rewards of doing so, the best will take less demanding assignments. We therefore recommend ongoing, school-based staff development activities. This is already possible with DPP programs, given the discretion school level staff have with program dollars. It should also be possible in middle and high school AI/DP programs.

5. Continuation of Program Services to Youngsters Beyond Initial Year

Students in the AI/DP and DPP programs have very serious attendance problems. Experience suggests that these youngsters will continue to need support after the program year. This is especially true for AI/DP and DPP students making the transition from middle school to high school. Initiatives must be designed in the 1986-87 school year which respond to the continuing needs of students who are technically no longer eligible for services.

6. Continued Experimentation to Improve Program Design

We also recommend, in keeping with the basic insight of this investigation, that continued serious attention be paid to the design and integration of various AIDP/DPP interventions. Rather than looking for the "one best" method, we should attempt to identify the strengths and weakness of all and their appropriateness and catalytic advantage in various settings. We emphasize the integration and catalytic advantage of approaches because it is entirely unreasonable to assume that a single intervention can counterbalance the social weight of a school that is not as a whole appropriate for its population.

We note in this regard, however, that existing implementation and outcome data tend to favor the structural/mini school approach to the serious truant in the short-run. The academic and emotional needs of youngsters are often so acute and the mainstream of many of our traditional high schools so ill structured relative to those needs that a special, resource-rich environment, set apart from the rest of the school seems to produce the most immediate value for the investment.

We must be cautious, however, in generalizing about program directions from this information. While the success of SOAR suggests that interventions must be deep and persuasive enough to affect the student's relationship to what goes on in the classroom, this can be accomplished in several ways. In the ameliorative mode we attempt to help the student adjust to the school, in the systemic approach we attempt to change the school, in the SOAR approach, the program provides an alternative to the classroom/ school. The last approach, the SOAR approach, works quickly but it is self-limiting in that the school remains the primary environment where most of the resources are concentrated, so its attractiveness must be examined in light of this constraint.

Nonetheless, the relative success of this approach makes it doubly important that any discrimination against limited English proficient students and other special needs populations be overcome. Special needs students tend to be discriminated against in mini schools because of the difficulty of spreading limited resources across competing needs.

7. Alleviation of Overcrowding in Target Schools

It appears the closing of school annexes kept pace with or outstripped enrollment decline in many New York City high schools. Add the factor of reduced class size and we find most of the schools PEA visited were

officially over-utilized, i.e. there were more students than seats. The irony of dropout prevention efforts in this context is that returning students have no where to go and the school has a powerful counterveiling incentive working against the goals of the program.

Even in schools which are not technically overcrowded the problem is manifest. Between more academic requirements and lower class size there are simply too few available rooms for counseling activities to take place with even a semblance of privacy. It is not uncommon to see several students and counselors huddled into a tiny room--hardly the ideal context for a private consultation.

There are three alternative solutions to the crowding problem: hold down enrollment in AI/DP and DPP schools, architectually or otherwise modify the use of existing space in these schools, or find additional room in a neighboring under-utilized facility. Each of the schools must be asked to project the costs and benefits of each of these approaches and, in collaboration with the Board of Education, make an appropriate selection. Despite the tradition of zoned schools accepting all students in their catchment area, we think the first solution has considerable merit. It is hard to reconcile the reality of today's large, overcrowded, urban school, serving a perponderance of underprepared students with the goal of quality education for all.

8. Central Board of Education Must Facilitate Contractual CBO Collaboration Agreements With CBOs.

Serious delays occurred in virtually all new programs developed collaboratively between the schools and community based organizations. Most new collaborations were not launched until December. This is the second year of serious sevice delays due to the contractual procedures adhered to by the Board of Education. The system of assigning a CBO to an individual attorney responsible for facilitating the contract did not work. Responsibility for resolving difficulties holding up contract approval should reside with the centrally-designated program manager: the Superintendent for Dropout Prevention, the Director of the Office of Student Progress, etc.

9. Program Assessment That Ties Implementation Findings With Outcome Results

Intensive analyses of outcomes from the 1984-85 AIDP program showed that at times programs which were very poorly implemented or never implemented evidenced more success than programs which were well implemented. The most likely explanation was selection bias. Schools showing improvements without programs were selecting youngsters who did not require services; for example, students whose attendance was atypically low in the previous year due to some calamity or a non-recurring illness.

It is important to eliminate the possibility of selection procedures which are irrational, unfair or a cover-up for the absence of program. It would be unwise, however, given the current state of information on how to work with dropout-prone students, to deny program managers needed opportunities to test strategies with eligible subpopulations of their own choosing. Rather than random assignment of students to programs, as a way of guarding against unfair selection procedures which bias program conclusions, we urge that monitoring and program evaluation efforts tie implementation findings empirically with outcomes. We also urge the auditing of schools' attendance records to ensure that only eligibles are served and that students are not unfairly discriminated against.

May/86

Table I

Implementation Data: Percent of Funds Accruing Due to Start Up Delays

Program	% Funds Accruing
AIDP High School Programs	
SOAR (N=2)	1.%
Strategies (N=1)	6.%
DPP High School Programs (N=6)	
Systemic Component	6.5%
CBO Component	21.0%
AIDP Middle Schools Program (N=4)	23.0%
DPP Middle Schools Programs (N=4)	
Systemic Component	18.5%
CBO Component	22.8%

* "N" equals the number of schools in the PEA sample

Table II

Indicators of Student Satisfaction

Programs	% Students Liking Program A Lot	% Students in Program Liking School More This Year	% Students Saying Program Helped Them Come to School More
AIDP H.S. Programs	70% (7/10)	90% (9/10)	80% (8/10)
DPP H.S. Programs	74% (17/23)	70% (16/23)	95% (18/19)
AIDP Middle School Programs	75% (15/20)	58% (11/19)	74% (14/19)
DPP Middle School Programs	60% (12/20)	57% (12/21)	67% (12/18)

The fraction following each percentage is the number of students positively responding to that item over the total number of respondants

Table III

School Climate Summary Sheet: Student Responses

	Truancy/Cutting	Disorder/Safety	Quality of School Life	Overall Satisfaction
AIDP H.S. Programs	2.5	1.9	3.4	3.6
DPP H.S. Programs	1.4	2.0	3.3	3.6
AIDP Middle School Programs	2.0	2.2	3.7	4.2
DPP Middle School Programs	2.0	2.1	3.4	3.6

The scale on which this table is based ranges from one to five, a score of one suggests a serious problem on that indicator; a score of five suggests an excellent performance.

Table IV

Summary of Students' and Staff's" Assessments of Various Programs

Program Type	Most Effective Features
I. SOAR/Strategies High Schools: Blocked classes with special focus curriculum, guidance and outreach.	Small classes, tailored curriculum, better supervision, more contact between teachers and students, group cohesion.
II. DPP High Schools: CBO case management; school-wide activities, guidance and outreach.	Mediation training, vocational training, counseling, attendance monitoring, outreach, private business program, jobs, incentives, high interest activities.
III. AIDP Middle Schools: Curricular and recreational offerings, tutoring, guidance and outreach.	Before/after/Saturday curricular and extra-curricular activities, tutoring, personalized attention to students, incentives, attendance monitoring, home visits, counseling.
IV. DPP Middle Schools: CBO curricular and recreational activities, tutoring; guidance and outreach.	Same as for AIDP middle schools

Table IV (cont'd)

Changes Needed to Enhance Existing Program	Changes Needed to Complement Existing Program
Curriculum development, more equipment/materials, overcome labelling, more dedicated staff, less paperwork.	Social services, jobs, career awareness, community support, parent involvement.
Organizational development: better staff and staff/CBO coordination, articulation between counseling and teaching functions and across programs, more space; greater student awareness of program, feelings of belonging to program, less paperwork.	Academic component: transition for returned truants, more high interest academic offerings (remedial, vocational, sex/ parenting classes), mini-school, tutoring; extra-curriculars, jobs, childcare, better middle/ high school linkage, student input, staff development, more staff, parent involvement.
Organizational development: better staff coordination, network of AIDP staff across schools, program coherence; group cohesion, better trained/supervised tutors, more dedicated staff, less paperwork.	Social services, more varied high interest curriculum and activities, school-wide attendance incentives, staff development, more guidance and outreach staff, parent involvement.
Organizational development: school/ CBO coordination; more equipment/ materials, better trained tutors, more regular system of meeting with students, less paperwork.	Expanded high-interest curriculum, incentives, trips outside neighborhood, vocational training, more guidance and outreach staff, parent involvement.